

REMARKS

By the present amendment, the specification has been amended to correct several apparent typographical errors and/or to improve its presentation. In addition, independent claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the concepts of the present invention by incorporating the subject matter of allowable dependent claim 2 therein. Consequently, claim 2 has been canceled.

It is submitted that these amendments to claim 1 are helpful in distinguishing the subject claims over the cited prior art and do not raise new issues which would require further consideration and/or search. In addition, it is submitted that such amendments place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. Furthermore, no additional claims are presented without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. In view of the above, it is submitted that entry of the above amendments is in order and such is respectfully requested.

Initially, applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 3 and 5 are allowed and claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 4 again were rejected under 35 USC §

103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Inoue et al in view of the '214 Japanese patent publication. In making this rejection, the examiner has asserted that the cited Inoue et al patent teaches the basic structure of an electrolytic solid capacitor in terms of foils and a separator as claimed. Although the examiner has acknowledged that the patent does not specifically teach the film coating for the cathode foil as claimed, it has been asserted that such would be apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art from the teachings of the '214 publication of a film coating of a carbon nitride of titanium and the like for a capacitor electrode of aluminum. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is respectfully requested.

As mentioned above, independent claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the concepts of the present invention by incorporating the subject matter of allowable dependent claim 2 therein. Thus, it is submitted that the subject rejection is now moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 1 and 4 as amended are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject application is now in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the undersigned hereby petitions

U.S. Serial No. 10/534,283
OA dated 4/28/06
Amdt. dated 7/28/06

for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



Donald W. Hanson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,133

Atty. Docket No. 050287
Suite 1000, 1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930
DWH/nk



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosure: Substitute Abstract